

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FUR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO). F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/043,362	10/043,362 01/09/2002		Warren M. Farnworth	4212.1US (99-0306.1)	7080
24247	7590	08/01/2003			
TRASK	3RITT		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2550				ZARNEKE, DAVID A	
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110				ZARIVERO, DA VID A	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2827	
				DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/043,362	FARNWORTH, WARREN M.					
7.447.667	Examiner	Art Unit					
	David A. Zarneke	2827					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 16 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP					
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) 🗵 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment					
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
10. Other:	David A. Farneke	Mirk. Stander MUXXI					

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The argument that the chip carriers of Reiff do not include the use of hermetic materials would require further consideration and possibly further searching.